



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,804	11/24/2003	Michael L. Boyer II	001227/1144	3096
69095	7590	12/03/2008		
STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN, LLP				
180 MAIDEN LANE				
NEW YORK, NY 10038				
EXAMINER				
RAMANA, ANURADHA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3775				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/718,804

Applicant(s)

BOYER ET AL.

Examiner

Anu Ramana

Art Unit

3775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 21-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-6 and 8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 7, 14-16, 24-25, 27-33 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-13, 21-23, 26 and 34-39 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,7, 14-16, 24, 25, 27-29 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Auge, II (US 2002/0022846 A1) in view of Smestad (US 4,430,760).

Auge discloses a method of providing a bone implant comprising: demineralizing (lines 9-10 of paragraph 0049) a block of cancellous bone (lines 3-4 of paragraph 0049) and compressing the block from the first geometry to a second geometry smaller than the first geometry (lines 16-17 of paragraph 0037). Auge discloses all of the limitations of the present invention except wetting the block; hardening the block after the block has been compressed to a second geometry; and exposing the block to a swelling agent.

Smestad teaches an implantable bone prosthesis which is "washed sequentially with water (wet/softened), ethanol, and ether to remove absorbed acid and dehydrate (harden) it (lines 51-53 of column 2) and wetting (exposing) the implant with sterile physiological saline (swelling agent) or the like before implantation (lines 8-9 of column 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have washed the implantable bone prosthesis with water to remove absorbed acid and to wash it with ethanol and ether to dehydrate it.

Claims 2, 30 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Auge in view of Smestad.

The combination as taught by Auge, II in view of Smestad discloses the claimed invention except for the second geometry having a pellet-like shape. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to press the first geometry of the combination taught by Auge in view of Smestad into a second geometry of pellet-like shape since Applicant has not disclosed that the shape solves any stated problem or is anything more than one of numerous shapes or configurations a person ordinary skill in the art would find obvious for the purpose of providing a bone graft. *In re Dailey and Eilers*, 149 USPQ 47 (1966).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive for the following reasons.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Auge clearly discloses compressing the bone block to fit within a defect (para [0048]). It is the examiner's position that wetting of the bone block would inherently occur once the block is placed in the defect. It is further noted that it is improper to read a specific order of steps into method claims where, as a matter of logic or grammar, the language of the method claims did not impose a specific order on the performance of the method steps, and the specification did not directly or implicitly require a particular order (*Altiris Inc. v. Symantec Corp.*, 318 F.3d 1363, 1371, 65 USPQ2d 1865, 1869-70 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (MPEP 2111.03)).

Full faith and credit has been given to the search and action of the previous examiner in accordance with MPEP 704.01.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9-13, 21-23, 26 and 34-39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anu Ramana whose telephone number is (571) 272-4718. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached at (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AR
December 1, 2008

/Anu Ramana/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3775